

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

DONALD E. MORISKY,

**Plaintiff,**

V.

MMAS RESEARCH LLC, et al.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:21-CV-1301-RSM-DWC

**ORDER GRANTING EXTENSION OF  
TIME**

On August 1, 2022, Defendants Steve Trubow and MMAS Research, LLC filed a Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction (“Motion for TRO”). Dkt. 69.<sup>1</sup> The Motion for TRO was noted for the Court’s consideration on the date it was filed. *See LCR 7.* Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 65, the party opposing the motion for a temporary restraining order has 48 hours to file a response. Plaintiff Donald E. Morisky has filed a Motion to Extend Time to

<sup>1</sup> The Court notes a motion for a temporary restraining order is noted for the same day. See LCR 7. However, a motion for a preliminary injunction should be noted on the fourth Friday from the filing date. *Id.* at (d)(3).

1 Respond (“Motion to Extend”), seeking an extension until August 9, 2022, to file a response to  
2 the Motion for TRO. Dkt. 72.

3 The Court has considered the Motion for TRO and the Motion to Extend. Based on the  
4 record before the Court, the Court finds an extension of time to respond to the Motion for TRO is  
5 appropriate.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, the Motion to Extend (Dkt. 72) is granted as follows:

- 6
- 7 • Plaintiff shall have until August 10, 2022 to file a response to the Motion for  
TRO; and
  - 8 • Defendants shall have until August 12, 2022 to file an optional reply.

9 The Clerk is directed to re-note the Motion for TRO (Dkt. 69) for August 12, 2022.

10 Dated this 3rd day of August, 2022.

11  
12   
13 David W. Christel  
United States Magistrate Judge

<sup>2</sup> Defendants did not stipulate to the extension of time. *See* Dkt. 72. The Court finds an extension of time is appropriate and finds a response from Defendants is not necessary.